		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	201	10/024,164	TALIN ET AL.
	diy	Examiner	Art Unit
		Kishor Mayekar	1753
All Participants:		Status of Application:	
(1) Kishor Mayekar.		(3)	
(2) William Koch.		(4)	
Date of Interview: 22 February 2005		Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description: .		ınt's representative)	
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
•			
Claims discussed:			
5, 13, 14, 16 and 23			•
Prior art documents discussed:  Prior art of record			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>			
	<u> </u>		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	Applicant/	/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Attorney agrees to correct by an examiner's amendment claim 5 to clearly define the claimed subject matter; claims 13, 14 and 16 to correct incorrect claim dependency; and the cancellation of claim 23 because the phrase "a suspension bath comprising" which reads on the prior art...